

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 16 are pending. Claims 2-4, 7, 10-15 and 17-20 are canceled.  
Claim 1 is amended.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of canceled claims 2 and 3, and to recite that the curved profile scanned by the laser means is designed entirely within the second face and has no intersecting portions. The amendments to claim 1 are supported by original claims 1-3, the specification at page 4, lines 26-27 and FIG. 1, for example. No new matter has been added.

#### **Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (US 5,276,298) in view of Becker (US 5,093,988).

Claims 2, 10 and 13 are canceled.

In order for obviousness to exist, In order for a claimed invention to be obvious, all of the claim recitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Claim 1 now recites a method in which laser means scan the second face along a predefined path that follows a curved profile. Neither Jones et al. nor Becker teaches or suggests scanning a second face of the bimetallic element along a curved profile. Thus, the combined disclosures of Jones et al. and Becker fail to teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 16 are allowable over Jones et al. and Becker.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of Becker, and further in view of Matsubara et al. (JP 54-116356).

Claims 3, 11 and 14 are canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method in which laser means scan the second face along a predefined path that follows a curved profile and the curved profile is designed entirely within said second face and has no intersecting portions. As stated above, neither Jones et al. nor Becker teaches or suggests scanning a second face of the bimetallic element along a curved profile. While Matsubara teaches a curved welding profile, Matsubara does not teach or suggest that the profile is designed entirely within one element of the welding junction or that the curved profile has no intersecting portions. See FIG. 2 of Matsubara, which shows that the welding profile has portions that intersect each other and cross the welding junction.

As described above, none of the cited references teach or suggest a curved welding profile that is designed entirely within the second face of the bimetallic element and that has no intersecting portions, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Jones et al., Becker and Matsubara does not render any of the pending claims obvious.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 22106-00062-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Application No. 10/500,367  
Amendment dated July 28, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2006

Docket No.: 22106-00062-US1

Dated: July 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Brian J. Hairston/  
Brian J. Hairston  
Registration No.: 46,750  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 331-7111  
(Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant